Docket No.: 200-1767

## **REMARKS**

- 1. The Office Action has objected to the specification because of specified informalities in Paragraphs 40, 44, 45 and 47. In response thereto, Applicants would direct the Examiner's attention to the amendments to the specification set forth above correcting these informalities. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.
- 2. The Office Action has rejected Claims 2 7 and 22 27 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. The Office Action identifies a number of locations in the claims where the phrase "open hook member" has no clear antecedent basis and where the use of the term "second bezel" is deemed confusing as no first bezel had been previously claimed. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants would direct the Examiner's attention to the amendments to Claim1 above to define the "retractable hook member" as the "retractable open hook member", thus providing antecedent basis for the use of "the hook member" in dependent Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6. Further, Applicant would direct the Examiner's attention to the amendments to Claim 21 to incorporate the limitations of dependent Claim 22, defining the included bezel as the "first bezel", and to define the retractable hook member as the "retractable open hook member", thus providing clear antecedent basis for the use of "the open hook member" in dependent Claims 23 – 26, and to clarify the "second bezel" in dependent Claims 25 – 27.

In view of the above amendments, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Docket No.: 200-1767

3. The Office Action has rejected Claims 1 and 21 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,338,136 (Hetchler). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants would direct the Examiner's attention to the amendments to independent Claims 1 and 21 to incorporate the limitations of dependent Claims 4 and 22, which have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

In view of these amendments, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

4. The Office Action has rejected Claims 2 and 25 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 5,338,136 (Hetchler) in view of U. S. Patent No. 4,907,921 (Akright). The Office Action states that Hetchler teaches the limitations of these claims except for the use of a recessed pivotally mounted closed hook, which teaching is provided by Akright. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants would direct the Examiner's attention to the amendments to independent Claims 1 and 21 to incorporate the limitations of dependent Claims 4 and 22, which have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. The limitations of Claim 2 have also been incorporated into Claim 1 and canceled from the application. Claim 25 is being retained in its original dependent form providing additional structural limitations further defining Applicants' invention as set forth in amended Claim 21.

In view of these amendments, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Docket No.: 200-1767

The Office Action has rejected Claims 3 and 26 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 5,338,136 (Hetchler) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,065,917 (Shambeau). The Office Action states that Hetchler teaches the limitations of these claims except for the use of a recessed pivotally mounted closed hook having actuator and engagement portions, which teaching is provided by Shambeau. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants would direct the Examiner's attention to the amendments to independent Claims 1 and 21 to incorporate the limitations of dependent Claims 4 and 22, which have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. The limitations of Claim 3 have also been incorporated into Claim 1 to provide proper antecedent basis and canceled from the application. Claim 26 is being retained in its original dependent form providing additional structural limitations further defining Applicants' invention as set forth in amended Claim 21.

In view of these amendments, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

6. The Office Action has indicated that Claims 4 – 7, 22 – 24 and 27 would be allowable if amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, noted above, and to rewrite the claims in independent form. In response thereto, Applicants would direct the Examiner's attention to the amendments to Claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of dependent Claim 4, and the limitations of dependent Claims 2 and 3 to provide appropriate antecedent basis. Applicants, however, have also amended dependent Claim 4 to be directed to the utilization of the shallow compartment of the first bezel to house the engagement portion of the closed hook member when in the retracted closed position.

**PATENT** 

Docket No.: 200-1767

Applicants would also direct the Examiner's attention to the amendments to

Claim 21 to incorporate the limitations of dependent Claim 22, which has been canceled from the

application. Dependent Claims 5, 23 and 24 have also been amended to correct various

informalities.

In summary, Claims 2, 3 and 22 have been canceled, Claims 1, 4, 5, 21, 23 and 24 7.

have been amended, and Claims 1, 4-7, 21 and 23 - 27 remain in the application. Applicants

request that all claims remaining in this case be allowed.

Pursuant to currently recommended Patent Office practice, the Examiner is

expressly authorized to call Applicants' attorney, if in his judgment disposition of this

application could be expedited or if he considers the case ready for final disposition by other than

allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 21 2004

Larry W. Miller, Reg. No. 29,417

Attorney for Applicants

Miller Law Group, PLLC

25 Stevens Avenue

West Lawn, PA 19609

Phone: 610-670-9000

Fax:

610-670-9901

- 11 -